

AUG. 23. 2007 6:44PM 866 741 0075

AUG 23 2007

Serial No. 10/073,374

- 7 -

REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Office Action of March 23, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-31 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. In response to the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20 and 26 are amended. Therefore, claims 1-31 are now pending in the present application and are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kujirai (US 2006/0119892) in view of Weaver (US 6,694,115). The Examiner notes that “[w]ith respect to claim 1, Kujirai discloses a system (Fig 1) comprising: an access code system that embeds at least one access code (password) in a job stream, and a job transmission system that transmits the job stream to a device (page 1, paragraphs 0007-0008 and page 3, paragraph 0038). Kujirai does not disclose each embedded code permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of the device.” The Examiner then states that “Weaver does disclose an access code (Identification Tag) permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of a printer device (col 2, lines 4-13, col 7, lines 15-30).” The Examiner states that “[t]he suggestion or motivation for [combining Kujirai with Weaver] would have been to ‘provide some users with access to a printing device that exhibits a particular configuration, while denying others such access’ (Weaver: col 1, lines 26-29).” Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Kujirai nor Weaver teaches an embedded code permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of the device, wherein each embedded code is dynamically established for the job, as is disclosed in independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26. As the Office has acknowledged, Kujirai does not disclose each embedded code permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of the device. Additionally, Applicants submit that Weaver does not disclose each embedded code permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of the device, wherein each embedded code is dynamically established for the job.

Instead, Weaver teaches a configuration-enabling system where a user has authorization to use a configuration of a printer (col. 7, lines 15-41). In Weaver, a user can configure a printer to use a feature, enabling the feature if it is not enabled. Alternatively, if the feature is unavailable on the printer, then the print process is halted. As in traditional printing

10702329.1

Serial No. 10/073,374

- 8 -

technology, this configuration-enabling system allows a user to select a configuration on a printer and enable it if it is available.


By using an identification tag to determine a user's authorization, the system of Weaver allows or disallows a user from using a printer. If the user is authorized, then the user may enable a desired configuration as long as the configuration is available for the printer. By contrast, the dynamically established embedded code of the present invention does not allow or disallow a user from using a printer, but instead controls the permissions that a user has at a particular printer, including features such as duplex printing, color printing, etc. Because neither Kujirai nor Weaver teaches each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26, specifically, an embedded code permitting access to a subset of device features, but not to other device features of the device, wherein each embedded code is dynamically established for the job, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Kujirai nor Weaver renders claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26 obvious.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26. Since claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-19, 21-25, and 27-31 depend from and contain the limitations of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26, respectively, they are distinguishable over the cited reference and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 20, and 26.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-23-07

  
Jessica M. Egner  
Registration No. 51,646

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, New York 14603-1051  
Telephone: (585) 263-1014  
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

10702929.1